

***California
Commission on Teacher Credentialing***

***Meeting of
September 5-6, 2001***

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: **PREP - 6**

COMMITTEE: **Preparation Standards Committee**

TITLE: **Plan for the Implementation of Standards of
Program Quality and Effectiveness in
Elementary Subject Matter Preparation,
Professional Teacher Preparation and
Professional Teacher Induction Pursuant to SB
2042**

XX Action

Information

Strategic Plan Goal(s):

- Goal 1:** **Promote educational excellence in California schools**
- Develop candidate and program standards that guide our local communities in the education of their children
 - Develop and administer teacher assessments

Prepared By: _____ **Date:** _____
 Margaret Olebe, Ph.D.
 Administrator
 Professional Services Division

Authorized By: _____ **Date:** _____
 Mary Vixie Sandy, Director
 Professional Services Division

_____ **Date:** _____
Sam W. Swofford, Ed.D.
Executive Director

**Plan for the Implementation of Standards of Program Quality and
Effectiveness in Elementary Subject Matter Preparation,
Professional Teacher Preparation and Professional
Teacher Induction Pursuant to SB 2042**

**Professional Services Division
August 21, 2001**

Executive Summary

In September, 1998, the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing launched an extensive standards and assessment development effort that led to the development of draft standards of quality and effectiveness for elementary subject matter preparation, professional teacher preparation and professional teacher induction programs. In January 2001, the Commission authorized an extensive field review of the draft standards, and in July a summary and analysis of field review findings were presented to the Commission. During July and August 2001, the standards were amended, based on field review findings and direction from the Commission and finalized for presentation to the Commission in September. A plan for the implementation of the newly adopted standards by institutions of higher education and local education agencies is presented for consideration by the Commission.

Policy Question

Should the Commission adopt the plan for implementing the Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Elementary Subject Matter Preparation, Professional Teacher Preparation, and Professional Teacher Programs?

Fiscal Impact Summary

The costs associated with developing and implementing new standards were estimated to be incurred over multiple years, and are included in the agency's base budget.

Recommendation

That the Commission adopt the proposed plan for the implementation of Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Elementary Subject Matter Preparation, Professional Teacher Preparation and Professional Teacher Induction Programs.

**Plan for the Implementation of Standards of Program Quality and
Effectiveness in Elementary Subject Matter Preparation,
Professional Teacher Preparation and Professional
Teacher Induction Pursuant to SB 2042**

**Professional Services Division
August 21, 2001**

Summary

This item presents a draft plan and timelines for use by institutions of higher education and local education agencies who propose to sponsor programs of elementary subject matter preparation, professional teacher preparation and/or professional teacher induction using the proposed standards of quality and effectiveness developed pursuant to SB 2042 currently under consideration for adoption by the Commission. Under this proposal, potential program sponsors would have twenty-seven months to transition from the current to the new standards beginning September 7, 2001, or immediately after the adoption of the standards by the Commission. All program sponsors will be offered technical assistance throughout the transition period, including several days of direct professional development and ongoing assistance from Professional Services Division staff and field staff from the BTSA program. This assistance will be delivered in regions roughly aligned with the current six BTSA clusters. The plan also provides for the selection and training of review panels to read submissions and make recommendations to the Committee on Accreditation, and for training and re-calibration of members of the Board of Institutional Reviewers. Incentives for early adopters of the new program standards, also a feature of the proposed implementation plan, are described.

Introduction

It has been the policy of the Commission to establish a window of time for sponsors of credential programs to transition from current practices at the time of adoption of new standards of quality and effectiveness for programs. Typically the transition timeline is two years from the date of adoption of new standards by the Commission. During the transition period, staff who have been directly involved as lead consultants to the advisory panel(s) in the development of the standards work with institutions to provide technical assistance in the development of new documents prepared in response to the new standards, and in the training and calibration of review panels who assess newly submitted documents in relation to the standards and make recommendations to the Committee on Accreditation for program approval. Most recently the Commission adopted new Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Pupil Personnel Services Credentials and simultaneously adopted an implementation schedule.

At this time the Commission is being asked to adopt three new sets of standards of program quality and effectiveness simultaneously. These three sets (Standards of

Program Quality and Effectiveness for Elementary Subject Matter Preparation, Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Preparation for the Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Credentials, and Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Induction for the Professional Multiple and Single Subject Credentials) affect the greatest number of institutions of higher education and local education agencies with currently approved programs. In addition, the inclusion of induction as a credential requirement inaugurates an entire new group of program sponsors into the approval process.

Currently there are 82 approved programs of elementary subject matter preparation and 84 approved programs of teacher preparation for the multiple and single subject credentials in California. Under the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) program there are currently 145 approved programs. Under SB 2042 multiple routes for induction programs include district sponsored alternatives and university sponsored programs, neither of which groups are currently represented under the BTSA umbrella. It should be anticipated that new programs may be submitted by program sponsors under these two options as well.

Since the scope of this implementation effort will far exceed previous experiences in the adoption of new program standards, staff is proposing a more structured implementation plan than those adopted by the Commission under normative practice.

Components of the Plan

I. Scope

Size. This plan provides for technical assistance and review of documents for prospective sponsors of approved programs of elementary subject matter preparation, professional teacher preparation and professional teacher induction. Under the plan these activities will be conducted by Commission staff and professional expert review panels appointed by the Executive Director for elementary subject matter and professional teacher preparation standards. For induction, staff from the Commission and the California Department of Education will provide technical assistance to prospective program sponsors, and jointly select and work with professional review panels for program approval of BTSA and district sponsored alternative programs. Induction programs sponsored by colleges and universities will be supported and reviewed by Commission staff and review panels.

A regional approach will be used. Staff will be assigned to a single area of the state that approximates one of the current BTSA clusters. Adjustments to the clusters will be necessary as institutions of higher education are not geographically distributed within California in a manner identical to the distribution of current BTSA programs. At this time there are from 21 - 30 programs in each of five BTSA clusters and 15 in the sixth cluster.

Duration. It is anticipated that the implementation period will commence immediately after the adoption of each set of standards by the Commission, and last approximately 27 months. Under current expectations, the timeframe is from September 2001 through December 2003. All programs should be approved under the new system by January 1, 2004.

Staff recognizes that there may be sound reasons to adjust this timeline. The professional teacher induction standards are subject to adoption by the State Board of Education (SBOE) and State Superintendent of Public Instruction (SSPI) under provisions of SB 2042 for district alternative and BTSA programs. Implementation of the Induction Standards will be jointly managed by the Commission and the California Department of Education through the interagency BTSA Task Force. Particular aspects of this implementation plan will need to be discussed and perhaps amended by the BTSA Task Force. The implementation timeline for local education agencies needing approval under these standards may need to be adjusted to accommodate the State Board and Superintendent Eastin's meeting agendas. It should be noted, however, that AB 1059 (Ducheny, 1999) provides that programs of preparation for the professional credential for multiple and single subjects must include professional standards for teaching English learners that have been approved by July 1, 2004 and that all multiple and single subject professional credentials issued by the Commission after July 1, 2005 must include an English Learner authorization. Under SB 2042 (Alpert, Mazzoni, 1998) the length of an induction program is two years. Any adjustment of this timeline for induction programs should take this provision of law into account.

In addition, it may become apparent during the implementation process that program sponsors need additional time in redesigning their programs and preparing faculty to teach to the new standards, which are more rigorous and complex than the current standards. In this instance, staff would report to the Commission on these realities and seek approval to make necessary adjustments.

Staff. Accreditation consultants and assistant consultants from the Professional Services Division will be assigned to work with elementary subject matter and multiple and single subject programs and BTSA consultants and assistant consultants will be assigned to work with induction programs during the transition. In addition, field staff who serve the BTSA clusters will provide technical assistance to induction program sponsors. There are 12 Commission staff and 6 - 12 BTSA field staff available to support this activity. Each staff member will be assigned a regional cluster to work with over the entire time, and act as a contact person for a specific set of program sponsors within the regional cluster.

Review and Approval of Proposed Programs. Expert review panels will be needed to review documents submitted for approval for all three types of programs. Members of review panels should be drawn from highly qualified professionals with expert knowledge and experiences in each preparation area under review. Typically, such panels are convened by the Executive Director, and are balanced between K-12 and higher education members. Panelists are drawn from a broad pool of educators who

submit applications and are recommended to the Executive Director after a careful review of their qualifications by staff. Under the proposed plan, panels of 25- 30 members would be drawn up for elementary subject matter preparation programs and professional teacher preparation programs for preliminary multiple and single subject credentials using standard Commission procedures. Panels of this size would ensure sufficient capacity to complete the work within the timeframe without undue burdens on individual panel members.

For professional teacher induction programs sponsored by local education agencies as BTSA programs or district-alternatives, the plan provides for selection of a panel of similar size and composition by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Commission's Executive Director. Induction programs sponsored by institutions of higher education are approved by the Commission pursuant to SB 2042. The Commission may choose to have these programs reviewed by the same panel, or ask the Executive Director to appoint a separate panel. Members of all panels will be trained prior to commencing document review.

II. Processes

Organization. As mentioned earlier in this report, technical assistance and training will be provided in regions organized around the six BTSA clusters. Professional Services Division staff, the CDE staff (pending CDE approval), and BTSA field staff will be assigned to each cluster. Numbers will be adjusted based on anticipated submissions in each cluster. Staff will be assigned as liaisons to a specific number of programs within the cluster, including programs of more than one type. This is intended to foster collaboration across phases in the learning to teach continuum.

Technical Assistance. This plan calls for a training of trainers model. SB 2042 lead staff will train consultants and BTSA field staff in how to provide technical assistance to IHEs and LEAs preparing to submit new program documents and how to train review panels. Modules for technical assistance workshops will be developed for use statewide. Staff will then provide training to program sponsors in each cluster using the modules. The training will consist of a half-day overview on the guidelines for submission and document preparation for all three program types, followed by a full day training for each specific program type. After the initial training, staff will work on a one to one or small group basis with the program sponsors to whom they have been assigned.

In addition training for members of the Board of Institutional Reviewers (BIR) will be revised to align with the new standards. Current members of the BIR will need to be re-calibrated in a revised training, possibly delivered electronically. New members of the BIR will need to be recruited as the current size of the BIR may not be adequate for the type of review called for in the new standards. One potential step in this direction would be to bring those trained in the BTSA formal program review process into the BIR, to create a merged pool of reviewers who have expertise across the learning to teach

continuum. It is anticipated that recalibration of current BIR members will take a day or a day and a half. Full BIR training will continue to be three days.

Review Procedures. The twenty-seven months time period will be divided into a planning period and a document submission period. The planning period is from September 2001 through January 2002. Submission guidelines will be developed for each type of program. Each prospective program sponsor will be asked to submit an implementation plan by January 30, 2002 that includes: (1) type(s) of programs to be submitted; (2) number of programs of each type; (3) contact information for each program; (4) submission date(s); and (5) information about participation in pilot and field review of the teaching performance assessment.

The initial planning period will be followed by four six months submission windows: January - June, '02; July - December '02; January - June '03; and July - December '03. Sponsors may potentially select different submission windows for different program types. A set number of available slots for each program type will be established for each submission window. This will provide for a predictable pace for review panels as they consider and reconsider submitted documents.

Panels will meet twice during each submission period to read initial submissions of program documents. Documents will be read by three panel members, none of whom come from the institution/district being reviewed or a nearby institution, district, or county office of education. With panels of 25 - 30 members in place, this should provide for reading of a maximum of three submissions per reviewer per cycle.

In most instances, program documents are not recommended for approval upon initial submission. To facilitate the review of resubmitted responses and additional documentation, Commission staff is exploring the use of web-based editing software. This software would enable reviewers to simultaneously read and make suggestions to program sponsors and each other on a single document placed on the web. This software is currently under development by Xerox at its research headquarters at Parc Xerox in Palo Alto and would be available for pilot use at no cost.

Incentives for Early Adopters. The state Title II advisory committee has approved the allocation of \$500,000 to support the efforts of those institutions interested in transitioning rapidly to the new standards. This includes institutions using the new standards in Spring '02 as a part of their accreditation visits, and other institutions that sponsor elementary subject matter preparation and multiple and single subject preliminary credential programs. A Request for Proposals for Early Adopters is currently being prepared by Commission staff. Under this program, successful applicants would be asked to submit documents in the first submission cycle so that they would be ready to admit candidates in the new program by September 2002. These grant recipients will also be required to participate in the pilot and field review of the teaching performance assessment, and to share their experiences and advice with institutions preparing documents for submission during later cycles.

Timeline of Activities

Table 1 summarizes the work to be completed under this plan. This plan includes twice yearly progress reports to the Commission on the implementation process.

III. Next Steps

Should the Commission approve the implementation plan, staff will prepare the necessary submission guidelines and planning documents, and notify the field.

**Table One. SB2042 Draft Implementation Plan –Timeline of Activities
August 21, 2001**

Activity	Sept. – Dec. '01	Jan. – June '02	July – Dec. '02	Jan. – June '03	July- Dec. '03
Preparation for Implementation Process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submit plan to CCTC for approval • Develop Submission Guidelines & Timelines • Develop Training Materials, all types • Develop Review Panel Guidelines and Materials 	Sept. Sept/Oct. Sept/Oct. Sept/Oct.				
Staff and Peer Reviewer Selection <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assign Staff to Regional Teams <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 CCTC accreditation consultants per region for ESM and Teacher Prep/TPA • 1-2 BTSA Cluster staff for Induction • Selection Process for Review Panel Members • Selection Process for BIR Team Members 	Sept. Nov. Nov.		Nov.		Nov.
Planning Process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distribute Submission Guidelines to all IHE's, Districts and COE's who sponsor programs • Institutions Submit Initial Plan (Intent to Submit) 	October	January			

Activity	Sept. – Dec. ‘01	Jan. – June ‘02	July – Dec. ‘02	Jan. – June ‘03	July- Dec.‘03
Implementation – Program Submissions* (statewide review panels) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cycle One – Early Adopters <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15 Liberal Studies • 15 Teacher Prep • 20 Teacher Induction Includes incentive grant recipients and those with site reviews in Spring ‘02 • Cycle Two – Regular Submissions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 25 Liberal Studies • 25 Teacher Prep • 40 Teacher Induction • Cycle Three – Regular Submissions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 30 Liberal Studies • 30 Teacher Prep • 40 Teacher Induction • Cycle Four – Final Submissions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 25 Liberal Studies • 25 Teacher Prep • 40 Teacher Induction 		X			
			X		
				X	
					X
• Progress Reports to CCTC	X	X	X	X	X

*Assumes review panels of 25 – 30 members meeting twice per cycle. Sub-groups of 3 read 2 or 3 submissions each. Assumes electronic submissions for initial review prior to panel meeting, and electronic review of re-submissions by panel sub-groups.

